

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

THE HISTORY OF THE

REPUBLIC OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BY

JOHN F. JOHNSON

OF THE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE

WAR DEPARTMENT

WASHINGTON

1890

THE

UNITED STATES

GOVERNMENT

PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON

1890

THE

UNITED STATES

GOVERNMENT

PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON

1890

THE

UNITED STATES

GOVERNMENT

PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON

1890

330.3
8 d

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

DEPARTMENT CIRCULAR 375

Washington, D. C.

December, 1925

AN EXTENSION PROGRAM IN HOME MANAGEMENT AND FARM MANAGEMENT FOR THE WESTERN STATES, WITH REPORTS OF STANDING REGIONAL COMMITTEES ON RANGE LIVESTOCK, DAIRYING, FARM CROPS, AND HUMAN NUTRITION.

W. A. LLOYD,

Regional Agent in Charge, Western Division,
Office of Cooperative Extension Work

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
Foreword	1	Report of committee on home management	9
Report of committee on range livestock	2	Report of committee on farm management	11
Report of committee on dairying	5	Report of coordinating committee	15
Report of committee on farm crops	6	Report of the program committee	16
Report of committee on human nutrition	7		

FOREWORD

A regional extension program has been in process of development in the Western States since 1922. This work is carried on through regional standing committees of extension workers collaborating with the United States Department of Agriculture. The work of these committees culminates each year in a regional conference in which those parts of the program previously adopted are reviewed and revised and new subjects considered.

At two preceding conferences, one held at Fort Collins, Colo., in 1923, and one at Tucson, Ariz., in 1924, the subjects of range livestock, dairying, human nutrition, farm crops (corn, oats, wheat, barley, alfalfa, and potatoes) were considered.¹ At a conference held in Pullman, Wash., November 8 to 12, 1925, these programs were further considered and a program in home management adopted. A conference of the farm-management demonstrators of Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, and Colorado was also held at the same time and place. The report of this conference was submitted to the regional coordinating committee and adopted by vote of the conference as a part of the regional extension program.

¹ U. S. Dept. Agr. Circs. 308 and 335.

The work of organizing facts and developing a regional extension program, begun by the Western extension forces in 1922, was brought one step nearer its goal at the Pullman, Wash., conference. The subject of this conference, home management, was emphasized as a fundamental project in the extension program, not only in home economics but also in agriculture. The rural population of the Western States has been migratory in its habits and has had a speculative attitude toward the land and an inherent instinct to seek improved conditions by changing location. Permanent agriculture is difficult to establish under such conditions, and the effectiveness of extension work is greatly lessened by the constantly changing farm population. The underlying purpose of the home-management project under Western conditions is to help to establish in the minds of farm people an attachment to the farm as a home and thus help to stabilize both social and economic conditions. A comfortable, convenient farm home with a satisfied, happy farm woman in it is believed to be the strongest influence tying the family to the farm. Much in the way of convenience, comfort, and beauty can be had with a small expenditure of money. The right of the home as well as the farm to have a share in the family income was recognized as coordinate with the maintenance of the farm as a profitable, productive unit.

The 1925 conference passed into a second phase in putting increased emphasis on means and agencies in carrying out the program. The standing regional committees brought in reports of progress illustrated by examples of successful procedure. Detailed plans were presented showing results obtained on various project phases adopted at previous conferences. These papers were made available in mimeographed form to extension workers in the different States.

An exhibition room was maintained where charts, posters, models, pictures, and other demonstration and illustrative materials were exhibited.

Although the regional fact-organization and program-building plan is only 3 years old, it has already proved its worth in enlarging the vision and broadening the horizon of extension workers. Both county extension agents and extension specialists are becoming increasingly conscious of the regional program, and each year are developing a better articulation and a stronger reenforcement. State administrative units must be maintained, but State boundaries rarely coincide with those of enterprise areas or economic relationships. These are peculiarly interstate in character in the Western States, and program determination, or what to do, becomes therefore a matter for common counsel. How the ends desired are to be achieved depends so largely on available funds, personnel, organization, and local conditions that procedure is largely a State or even a county matter.

Excerpts from the reports of the regional standing committees, together with their recommendations, follow.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RANGE LIVESTOCK

The Department of Agriculture has met our request for periodical outlook reports dealing with the cattle and sheep industries. Such reports should be given the widest circulation possible through farm

press releases, local mediums of publicity, and by county agents. Doubtless these reports will need review to meet regional situations. Such reviews must be given careful thought on the part of the economic as well as livestock specialists. The preliminary economic studies of the cost and methods of range-cattle production by the Department of Agriculture requested by the committee of 1923 are now completed for the northern Great Plains livestock area, and will soon be under way in the Southwest. It is hoped that tabulations of this work will be available at an early date. These studies should be of immeasurable value in pointing the way to improved livestock methods.

Following the recommendations made at Tucson, Ariz., Directors Creel of Nevada and Peterson of Utah, with your committee chairman, obtained a conference with the President of the United States to present the matter of the relation of the public-land situation to the possibilities for improved range management. The President expressed great interest in the problem and signified his intention of referring the whole question to the agricultural conference which was to meet the following week. The question was also discussed with three members of the conference. It is gratifying that essentially the same recommendation made by the committee on range livestock at Tucson with regard to this question was made by the President's agricultural conference. As a result of these recommendations the Senate Committee on Public Lands has just completed hearings on the public land question in all the Western States.

In carrying out its work the committee called for a report from each State showing progress and goals in 1925. The reports showed that fewer projects had been adopted than in 1924 and indicated that efforts were concentrated instead of being scattered over a large field. It was found that work on wool grading takes the lead, followed by work on revegetation. The latter project consists of test plantings of newly introduced grasses in only one State. The introduction of improved grazing methods and cattle grading ranked next in widespread adoption. Rodent control and culling of females came next on the list, followed by the introduction of purebred sires.

If the livestock committee is to continue functioning in the way of procuring reports on projects and accomplishments, some uniform method of reporting must be devised. If progress is to be measured as a unit in the Western States, the standing committees or fact-progress committees will do well to consider this matter in comparing 1924 and 1925. Reports indicate clearly that better progress has been made this year than last in all the major projects except the introduction of purebred sires. The two projects which show outstanding improvement in results obtained are the culling of females and cattle grading. A rather superficial study of reports for the two years shows the work increasing on the projects of water development, improved grazing methods, revegetation, salting, herding, fattening cattle, control of disease and of poisonous plants, and studies of cost of production.

Each State was asked to name the three activities that it had carried on most successfully during the year. Replies indicated that cattle grading, culling of females, wool grading, and introducing improved grazing methods had been the most successful.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON RANGE LIVESTOCK

PROGRAM

The economical production and efficient marketing of high-quality stock should continue to be the policy of the Western States range livestock program.

The production of high-class stock, culling of females, and use of purebred sires are of primary importance.

Economical production can be brought about in a greater measure by controlled breeding, reduction of losses, and improved grazing methods, which contribute to the production of a higher percentage of calf and lamb crops. Information acquired through studies of cost of production should be used in pointing the way toward more economical production.

More efficient marketing will be realized through a thorough knowledge of market classes and grades and a more general understanding and use of market news service. The continuation of grading demonstrations and a wider dissemination of properly interpreted market news information is desirable.

We commend the efforts of the Bureaus of Agricultural Economics and Animal Industry in furnishing periodic outlook reports and in starting economic surveys of the Western range-cattle industry, as requested by this committee at its meeting in Tucson in 1924.

METHODS

A study of successful range-livestock extension projects reveals the importance of certain principles contributing to their success. Experience has shown that the problem to be attacked should be determined by the stockman in cooperation with the county agent and specialist, the initiative usually being taken by one of the latter. Such procedure is likely to enlist greater interest on the part of the individual demonstrator, as the problem attacked will be peculiarly his own. The most successful demonstrations are those that are conducted over a period that is sufficient to produce positive and definite results. A definite understanding of the procedure of the demonstration is essential and can best be obtained from a written agreement or outline left with the demonstrator.

The demonstration meeting is of primary importance in campaigns that are made for the adoption of the practices demonstrated. It is highly desirable that local stockmen take a leading part in arranging for and conducting such demonstration meetings. Meetings of organized stockmen furnish an excellent medium for giving publicity to results of demonstrations.

C. F. MONROE,

Chairman, Extension Director, New Mexico,

E. J. IDDINGS,

Extension Director, Idaho,

B. W. FAIRBANKS,

Extension Animal Husbandry Specialist, Colorado,

C. M. HUBBARD,

Extension Animal Husbandry Specialist, Washington,

E. F. RINEHART,

Extension Animal Husbandry Specialist, Idaho,

Committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON DAIRYING

The general purpose of the dairy committee has been to show two things: (1) The more important projects being followed or advocated in the several States, and (2) the extension methods used.

In view of the nearness to the time when the 1925 agricultural census will be available, no attempt has been made this year to revise our objectives or goals in production for the Western States. Although the 1923 program, including goals and objectives, continues to hold good, a well-founded economic and production program based on an analysis of the 1925 census and on a study of western conditions would add impetus and solidity to the Western States dairy program. It is along these lines that the United States Department of Agriculture can be of greatest assistance to the West in the furtherance of dairy development.

The Western States have followed the lines of work of 1924, and made cow-testing associations their major project. They have increased their effort to extend the influence and work of the association plan to the smaller and more isolated dairymen through testing circles. Disappointment has been met in a few instances, but the scope and the use of the testing-circle plan are spreading.

The introduction of purebred sires of merit continues to equal cow-testing associations as a major project. One of the important organized plans is to use the bull association to introduce purebred sires of high quality.

Progress reports this year have shown more clearly the value of the western dairy program in demonstrating further the soundness of the original draft of the program by the resultant spread of proven extension methods, increased interest in State programs, and wider use of tours, campaigns, and publicity.

Although the efforts exerted last year to stabilize the dairy industry undoubtedly have had some effect, the shortage of feed in the West during 1924 and the improved prices for wheat and other farm products have curtailed dairy production to the extent of bringing decidedly higher prices for dairy products.

Because of the high price of butter, substitutes have again become a matter of concern to the dairy industry, which calls for increased vigilance on the part of dairymen in maintaining a good quality of product and in advertising it effectively.

In the face of these changing conditions, the dairy committee appreciates more keenly the need of working closely with the nutrition committee in the furtherance of western programs.

The analysis of extension methods used in furtherance of dairy projects shows a continued weakness in the use of tours, campaigns, and publicity, though considerable improvement has been shown in the work over 1924.

Dairy practices on the whole are well enough established to be particularly well adapted to this form of extension. Cow-testing associations of themselves have not half filled their purpose unless their results in improving production, feeding, care, and management are analyzed carefully and made known to the masses of dairymen by tours, publicity, and campaigns.

The committee calls special attention to the plan now being put into effect by the Bureau of Dairying for the rapid tabulation of

testing-association records, so that the resultant information may be used in campaigns and publicity and in dairy management.

We recommend that the work of the dairy committee for next year be directed to the special problems of tours, campaigns, and publicity, and that concrete results of good extension methods used in these lines be brought before the 1927 conference.

ROUD McCANN,
Chairman, Extension Director, Colorado,
PAUL V. MARIS,
Extension Director, Oregon,
D. L. FOUNT,
Extension Dairy Specialist, Idaho,
D. G. MAGRUDER,
Extension dairy Specialist, Washington,
Committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FARM CROPS

SURVEY OF SEED-IMPROVEMENT WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

Twenty-six States have State seed-improvement associations of one kind or another. In eight States the work is done by small local organizations such as the county seed-improvement association. Colorado is a good example of the latter group and has probably eight or ten counties doing seed-improvement work.

In two States—Maine and Washington—the State department of agriculture directs the work. State appropriations for seed improvement are made in nine States: Maine, Maryland, Virginia, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Idaho, and Washington. Only in Virginia and Wisconsin, however, is the appropriation large enough really to support the work.

Twenty States help to support seed certification by membership fees, 21 have inspection fees, and 5 levy a sales tax. Kansas has one of the best examples of the sales tax and is getting more income from it than from any other one thing. Virginia keeps a full-time paid secretary and New York a part-time paid secretary. Tennessee has a \$20,000 endowment from which one-third of the salary of a part-time secretary is paid.

In nine States the seed associations are incorporated. Maine, Minnesota, and Washington are the only three where seed certification is mentioned in State laws. The others have nothing more than the pure-seed law. This law is enforced in 9 States by the college and in 31 by some State organization, like the State department of agriculture.

In 17 States the cost of field inspection is paid by the seed-improvement associations and in 8 other States the seed association pays the salary and expenses of the inspectors while they are at work.

In three States—Wisconsin, Colorado, and Montana—the county agents, as their reports indicate, have a definite part in helping with the inspection. Six States—Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, Nebraska, and Texas—have a certification committee which examines the reports of inspectors and decides whether the crop can be certified or not.

Eleven States have as secretary a representative of the college who is not an extension man; in 10 States the extension agronomist is

secretary, and in 4 States the position is filled by some one not connected with the college. So far the work has been largely a college concern.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON FARM CROPS

(1) We recommend that the basis of crops extension work be a survey of factors affecting crop production and marketing in the State, district, or other area concerned.

(2) We recommend that special attention be given by the various experiment stations and extension workers to the economic use of irrigation water in all lines of crop production and that this work be adopted as a part of the crops program of the Western States comparable in importance with the four lines of work already adopted.

(3) We recommend that a project on weed control or eradication be added to the Western States crop program and that this project emphasize educational rather than police methods in obtaining the cooperation of farmers.

(4) We recommend to the program committee that the conference be held after January 1 in order to avoid a duplication of reporting the crop work for the year.

(5) Recognizing the value of an adequate fruit and vegetable garden for both health and economy, we recommend that the entire extension service give more attention to this phase of the Western States' program.

(6) Recognizing that seed improvement is fundamental to prosperous agriculture and that seed certification is an invaluable means of seed improvement, we recommend:

(a) That all seed-improvement associations eventually do their own inspection, finance fully the work of seed certification and improvement, and take the responsibility for certification.

(b) That seed-improvement work eventually be put on a commodity basis and associations be grouped around one commodity.

(c) That emphasis be placed on close association of educational work with any seed certification done.

(d) That consideration be given to procuring the cooperation of young men between the ages of 18 and 25 in seed-improvement association; also to the fact that young men who have had training in junior extension work are likely to be excellent cooperators in this piece of work.

P. H. ROSS,

Chairman, Extension Director, Arizona,

LEROY B. SMITH,

Assistant County Agent Leader, California,

O. S. FISHER,

Extension Agronomist, Office of Cooperative Extension

Work, United States Department of Agriculture,

Committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON HUMAN NUTRITION

The outstanding feature of the work on the nutrition project during 1925 is the manner in which plans for the year's work were made, specific goals set, and the work of the year held to these plans. This has meant an improved ability to judge the Western States nutrition program and a marked conservation of time and effort in carrying out the work. In a number of States the nutrition project still is in the pioneer stage. During the past year and a half changes in

the personnel of the State leaders or nutrition specialists directing this project have been made in 5 of the 11 States. All this of necessity means a reappraisal of the problem and a readjustment of the methods involved.

If proper food is to be selected and prepared, a supply must be available. To procure this supply practically all the States are giving more attention to growing farm home gardens and to increasing the milk supply. These problems are allied closely to the agricultural and home-economic program of the Western States, and the entire extension force should feel more personal responsibility than it sometimes has shown. Garden clubs and garden demonstrations are slowly increasing under persistent effort of the extension agents, and a few States have family cow and goat demonstrations. The active help of county agricultural agents and agricultural specialists is needed urgently in connection with this project. In the coming year this joint responsibility should be emphasized. All but one of the States reported that work in some form of food selection is being carried on in a thorough and persistent manner, which ultimately must produce permanent results in obtaining a safe diet for the Western States.

Each State reports carrying on some form of child health and nutrition work. In two States the nutrition specialist is the head of the clearing house for the unifying of agencies in the State dealing with child health. These are welded into cooperative effort to carry on work with both school and preschool children. By this cooperation doctors, nurses, schools, and extension forces are brought together. The work appears to be well organized and is worth investigating and adopting elsewhere. A decided increase is noted in the use of boys and girls' clubs to demonstrate nutrition facts. Practically all States have meal-preparation, garden, and canning clubs. All States are making a gratifying attempt to carry out the recommendations adopted by the Tucson conference which suggested limiting efforts to a few major problems, adopting specific goals and definite measurements of results, increasing the use of local leaders, and making wider use of boys and girls' club members to demonstrate nutrition facts. The major projects are improved food supply, particularly through the farm home garden; canning and storage; family food selection and preparation; child health demonstrations; hot school lunches; and group-training work with the preschool child and its mother.

There was a time when extension directors looked upon the nutrition project with doubt and suspicion. It seemed highly technical and vague in its aims and methods. We are confident that this stage has been passed in the Western States, that each State is studying the practical problem of three square meals a day in terms of food supply, family food habits, and food preparation, that an increasing percentage of the population is being reached effectively, and that all this is being done with regard to funds and time available for this project. We can not have well-fed people unless the agriculture of this region is planned to meet their needs, and conversely we can not have successful agricultural production unless the people engaged in the work are healthy and well-nourished and able to do efficient work.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON HUMAN NUTRITION

(1) The committee on human nutrition commends the progress made during the past year by the Western States in carrying out the regional nutrition program recommendations, in particular the establishment of more specific goals and the measurement of definite results. There still appears a need for more concentration on a few fundamental problems, and to this end a continuation of effort to unify and simplify the nutrition program is desirable in order to reach the largest number of people with the few workers and limited funds available.

(2) In order to further and to strengthen the programs now under way, we recommend that the following points be emphasized during 1926 and 1927:

(a) That project presentation be reduced to simple practices.

(b) That extra effort be given to local-leader training.

(c) That the ultimate goal of all work with food habits be physical growth and efficiency.

(d) That a systematic plan be devised to procure food supplies to meet dietary needs through adequate farm-home production, preservation, and storage methods.

(e) That continued consideration be given to nutrition work in connection with junior extension activities.

(f) That adequate community, county, and State publicity be developed.

(3) We commend the work already done by the United States Department of Agriculture in response to the request made by this committee at Fort Collins in 1923 and at Tucson in 1924 to assist in furthering the foods and nutrition program of the extension service through both research and investigation of extension methods. We urge the importance of further research in human nutrition on foods and problems peculiar to this region by the Western States experiment stations under the Purnell Act.

CECIL W. CREEL,

Chairman, Extension Director, Nevada,

A. E. BOWMAN,

Extension Director, Wyoming,

RENA B. MAYCOCK,

State Home Demonstration Leader, Utah.

MARY E. STILLWELL,

Assistant Extension Director, Nevada,

LUELLA P. SHERMAN,

Acting State Home Demonstration Leader, Wyoming,

Committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON HOME MANAGEMENT

EXTENSION PROGRAM IN HOME MANAGEMENT

OBJECTIVE

The objective in the home-management program is a still better standard of living for the farm family through (1) better management of time and labor and (2) better management of income and material resources.

The demonstrations that have for their ultimate goal the conservation of time and energy are those in labor-saving home equipment; kitchen improvement and rearrangement; installation of water, sewage-disposal, light, and heating systems; house planning and re-

modeling; and housekeeping methods and schedules. The extension projects relating to business methods are those emphasizing records of the home supply of products used; budgeting the needs of the home and family, and the expenditure of funds; the keeping of accounts of the household business; and organized cooperative methods in marketing home products.

Project plans should provide for young people as well as adults when the plans can be adapted to junior extension activities. The participation of the rural-engineering and farm-management specialists is necessary for the fullest development of the home-management program.

CONDITIONS IN WESTERN STATES

(1) Farm incomes vary widely from area to area and from year to year, but in general a high standard of living is possible, although strict economy is necessary.

(2) Expenditure of cash for necessities which farms can be made to produce lowers the amount available for improvements.

(3) Farmers in many sections have a speculative attitude toward their business and are slow to build permanent homes.

(4) An undue proportion of the farm woman's time is occupied by housekeeping duties, because of

- (a) Lack of available hired help.
- (b) Participation in farm enterprises.
- (c) Necessity for housing and feeding farm help.
- (d) Houses poorly built, equipped, and arranged.
- (e) Lack of public utilities in rural districts.

(5) Traditional or racial housekeeping habits.

(6) Migratory population in some areas.

(7) Non-English-speaking peoples in some areas.

(8) An abundance of hydroelectric power, and the possibility of its use for rural homes.

APPLICATION TO THE EXTENSION PROGRAM

Activities emphasized in extension projects:

(1) Finding new methods of adding to cash income.

(2) Simplification of household tasks, including introduction of necessary and desirable equipment.

(3) Use of better methods of doing household work and efficient arrangement of the necessary equipment.

(4) Budgeting of time, basing plans on records kept by the home makers themselves.

(5) Budgeting of money, considering immediate and future needs, and basing budgets on records of cash expenditures and of supplies contributed by the farm.

(6) Using to the best possible advantage the material resources of the home and farm—food, equipment, fuel, clothing, housing.

(7) Utilizing electricity in the home.

(8) Wise spending of the money and time available for adding to the comfort and attractiveness of the home.

The above activities will be approached through—

(1) Study of information concerning rural economic and social conditions.

(2) Encouragement of research having to do with rural standards of life.

PROJECTS UNDER WAY IN 1925

- I. Management of time and labor:
 - (1) Time and labor-saving equipment (smaller equipment).
 - (2) Kitchen improvement and rearrangement.
 - (a) General plan.
 - (b) Kitchen contest plan.
 - (3) Housekeeping methods.
 - (a) Time schedules and work planning.
- II. Rural engineering:
 - (1) House planning and remodeling.
 - (2) The modern systems.
 - (a) Lighting.
 - (b) Heat.
 - (c) Water.
 - (d) Sewage disposal.
- III. Management of income and material resources:
 - (1) Household accounts.
 - (2) Financial budgets.
 - (3) Food and clothing budgets.
- IV. Closely allied home-improvement projects:
 - (1) House furnishing.
 - (a) Living-room improvement.
 - (b) Own-your-own-room clubs.
 - (2) Farmstead beautification.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON HOME MANAGEMENT

The committee recommends the following projects for emphasis in the Western States extension program for 1926:

- (1) Kitchen improvement.
- (2) Installation of water and sewage-disposal systems.
- (3) Improvement in home furnishings which make for comfort and attractiveness.
- (4) Home accounts and budgets.
- (5) House planning and remodeling.

S. B. NELSON,
Chairman, Extension Director, Washington,
A. E. BOWMAN,
Extension Director, Wyoming,
MAUD M. WILSON,
Assistant Extension Director, Washington,
MADGE J. REESE,
Field Agent, Western Division,
Office of Cooperative Extension Work,
United States Department of Agriculture,
W. A. LLOYD,
Regional Agent in Charge, Western Division,
Office of Cooperative Extension Work,
United States Department of Agriculture,
Committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FARM MANAGEMENT

OUTSTANDING FARM AND RANGE MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS IN WESTERN STATES

In compiling the following list the committee made no attempt to formulate a complete statement. It assumed that in the development of regional programs specific problems will be brought into relief and their relationship and relative importance will become apparent. The farm-management demonstrators fully appreciate the present

work of research agencies in the field of farm and range management and desire to express their approval of the present tendency of research agencies to concentrate on specific problems growing out of extension programs and coordinated extension activities.

RANGE LIVESTOCK AREAS

(1) The minimum size of ranch business which will return an income sufficient to give a standard of living comparable with other types of farming.

(2) The kind of water-feed crops and fattening-feed crops that, when used in combination with summer grazing areas, will give the largest net profits in different types of ranching.

(3) The determination of standards of carrying capacity of the different classes and grades of grazing land and the relationship of these standards to the valuation and taxation of such lands.

(4) Better knowledge of the unit requirements in the production of different classes of livestock under different systems of ranching.

(5) The development of systems of livestock credit adapted to the character of turnover in the different livestock enterprises.

(6) Adjustments in production and management to meet adequately the present and anticipated market and economic conditions.

Following are suggestive specific problems related to efficiency within the livestock enterprises:

(1) How can the calf or lamb crop be increased without increasing the unit cost of production?

(2) Least-cost method of wintering of breeding animals.

(3) What systems of grading and selling will reflect more adequately the value of high-quality production?

(4) How can small units of privately owned grazing land be consolidated into economic range units?

(5) What are the possibilities of combination of the different kinds and classes of livestock on the same range?

(6) What are the unit costs of production and their relation to the net-ranch income under different systems of producing various classes of livestock under western range conditions?

DRY-FARMING AREAS

(1) The determination of areas which under present economic conditions and present costs are submarginal for the production of the cultivated cash crops.

(2) The development of types of dry-farm organization which will absorb the risks of crop failure and which will include supplemental enterprises that will provide family living and the fixed overhead expenses during years of poor crops.

(3) Low-cost practices.

(a) *Wheat*.—Reducing wheat-production cost by low-cost tillage, through big teams and efficient tractor operation. Reducing harvest costs through combines and header barges.

(b) *Corn*.—Low-cost operations.

(4) How can outlook material be given regional interpretation so as to be of greatest value to dry-land farmers in particular areas in choosing and adjusting their enterprises?

IRRIGATED AREAS

(1) What is the minimum size of irrigated-farm business in a particular area and type of organization which will produce an income sufficient to maintain an American farm standard of living?

(2) What choice of enterprises is possible in specific irrigated areas, and what are the long-time anticipated returns that may be expected from these enterprises in specific areas?

(3) What are the most profitable combinations of enterprises for particular irrigated areas, and how can these combinations best be adjusted to the local and wider market trends? What are the relative advantages and disadvantages of these enterprises in their particular combinations with other competing areas?

(4) Determination of the least-cost practices within specific enterprises in specific areas.

(5) The determination of unit requirements, fixed overhead costs of production, and comparative advantage and disadvantage of enterprises and combinations in the undeveloped irrigated areas, with the object of determining whether or not economic conditions would justify the development of such areas.

SPECIALIZED TYPES OF FARMING

(1) What are the long-time outlook and relative advantage and disadvantage of competing areas in the production of highly specialized commodities?

(2) What are the possibilities of the development of enterprises which will utilize available labor and other farm resources that now are used in the special enterprises?

(3) To what extent should the production of low-quality specialized commodities be discouraged when these are produced in farm combinations of such a nature that the outlook for improving their quality is not encouraging? How can farms that are now producing low-quality specialized products be reorganized so as to eliminate the low-quality enterprises and at the same time to present this point of view to the low-quality producing farmers?

(4) How can the production of highly specialized commodities be best adjusted to meet present long-time market prospects?

SUMMARY OF MATERIAL FOR FARM-MANAGEMENT USES

I. MATERIAL AVAILABLE

- (1) Enterprise-cost records and summaries.
- (2) Illustrative material on low-cost practices.
- (3) Farm-business analysis records, obtained through surveys and farm accounts.
 - (4) Records from cost-route studies.
 - (5) State crop and livestock statistics.
 - (6) State and national outlook reports.
 - (7) State and national trade statistics.
 - (8) Prices, movements, and the like.
 - (9) Instructions and laboratory exercises for teachers and pupils in teaching farm accounting in rural schools.
 - (10) Federal crop and market reports.
 - (11) Bureau of Agricultural Economics charts on prices and production.
 - (12) United States Census reports.
 - (13) Agricultural situation.
 - (14) Foreign crops and markets.
 - (15) Maps outlining types of farming in the United States by States and regions.

II. MATERIAL NEEDED²

- (1) National and regional outlook and production-trend information on leading enterprises of the West.
- (2) Regional enterprise-cost and practice studies, such as range-beef study.
- (3) Enterprise economic studies such as:
 - (a) Peach-cost studies in California.
 - (b) Prune and pear cost studies in Oregon.
 - (c) Poultry-cost studies in Washington.
- (4) Farm-management surveys covering each major type of farming.
- (5) Summaries of price material and indices on leading enterprises in the West.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON FARM MANAGEMENT

(1) *Farm enterprise efficiency.*—To determine profitable methods of production through the analysis of production costs and practices, the farm-management demonstrator, aided by the subject-matter specialist, county agent, and research workers, will obtain cost records on the important enterprises of the county.

(2) *Farm organization and farm accounting.*—To teach farmers better business methods, to guide them in adjusting their farm organization to meet changing economic conditions, and to reduce production costs, the farm-management demonstrator, in cooperation with research workers and county agents, will obtain records in typical farm areas.

(3) *Dissemination of timely economic information.*—In order to aid farmers in the planning of their production programs to meet more nearly the probable market demands, the farm-management demonstrator will furnish economic facts of the following nature:

- (a) Timely reports on the agricultural situation and outlook.
- (b) Analyses of price, production, and related trends.

(4) *Aid in developing county, regional, and State agricultural programs.*—The farm-management demonstrator, the faculty of the agricultural college and experiment station, and extension workers will gather facts upon which to base sound agricultural programs.

H. M. DIXON,

Chairman, Farm Economist, Office of Cooperative Extension Work, United States Department of Agriculture,

R. S. BESSE,

Farm Management Demonstrator, Oregon.

L. W. FLUHARTY,

Farm Management Demonstrator, California,

T. H. SUMMERS,

Farm Management Demonstrator, Colorado,

R. N. MILLER,

Farm Management Demonstrator, Washington,

M. L. WILSON,

In charge, Division of Farm Management and Costs, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture,

EUGENE MERRITT,

Field Agent, Western Division, Office of Cooperative Extension Work, United States Department of Agriculture, Committee.

² Note the statement of problems in this report.

REPORT OF COORDINATING COMMITTEE

The above reports, as reviewed and revised by the coordinating committee, were recommended to the Pullman, Wash., conference for adoption.

W. A. LLOYD,
Chairman, Regional Agent in Charge, Western Division,
Office of Cooperative Extension Work, United States
Department of Agriculture,
C. F. MONROE,
Extension Director, New Mexico,
CECIL W. CREEL,
Extension Director, Nevada,
P. H. ROSS,
Extension Director, Arizona,
S. B. NELSON,
Extension Director, Washington,
ROUD McCANN,
Extension Director, Colorado,
Committee.

On motion, the reports were adopted by the conference.

REGIONAL STANDING COMMITTEES

On account of several vacancies on the regional standing committees caused by changes in the personnel of the State extension services, the coordinating committee recommended that the standing committees be reconstructed as follows:

RANGE LIVESTOCK

C. F. Monroe, chairman, New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, State College, N. Mex.
Cecil W. Creel, University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
E. F. Rinehart, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
C. U. Pickrell, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
B. W. Fairbanks, State Agricultural College of Colorado, Fort Collins, Colo.

DAIRYING

Paul V. Maris, chairman, Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis, Oreg.
Roud McCann, State Agricultural College of Colorado, Fort Collins, Colo.
V. E. Scott, University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
G. E. Gordon, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
D. L. Fourt, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.

NUTRITION

B. H. Crocheron, chairman, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
E. J. Iddings, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
Rena B. Maycock, Agricultural College of Utah, Logan, Utah.
Luella P. Sherman, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
Stella Mather, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.

FARM CROPS

- P. H. Ross, chairman, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
 J. C. Taylor, Montana State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Bozeman, Mont.
 Leonard Hegnauer, State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash.
 G. R. Quesenberry, New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, State College, N. Mex.
 J. C. Hogenson, Agricultural College of Utah, Logan, Utah.

HOME MANAGEMENT

- A. E. Bowman, chairman, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
 S. B. Nelson, State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash.
 May Secrest, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
 Miriam Hawkins, Montana State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Bozeman, Mont.
 Jessie D. McComb, Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis, Oreg.
 On motion, the recommendation was adopted by the conference.

REPORT OF THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

The program committee for the next Western States extension conference brought in the following report:

That the next meeting be held at the University of Nevada, Reno, July, 1927. The change of time of meeting is to facilitate the procuring of reports on projects for consideration by the conference through the standing committees. Each standing regional committee is to develop its report requirements in time for them to be incorporated in the 1926 annual reports of county extension agents and specialists.

The subject for regional program consideration for the next conference will be poultry and clothing. It is requested that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture make an economic study of the poultry enterprise under western conditions that will include both the specialized poultry industry and the farm flock, and report its findings at the Reno conference. The recommendation made at the Tucson conference in 1924 that an economic study of the dairy industry under western conditions be undertaken is renewed, with the hope that at least a preliminary report may be ready for consideration by the dairy committee at the Reno conference.

CECIL W. CREEL,
Chairman, Extension Director, Nevada.
 WILLIAM PETERSON,
Extension Director, Utah.
 MADGE J. REESE,
Field Agent, Western Division,
Office of Cooperative Extension Work,
United States Department of Agriculture.
 W. A. LLOYD,
Regional Agent in Charge, Western Division,
Office of Cooperative Extension Work,
United States Department of Agriculture.
Committee.

7-1201-8

